



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,129	03/06/2000	KENJI UEDA	A-346	7895

802 7590 03/07/2002

DELLETT AND WALTERS
310 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE
SUITE 1101
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1756

10

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ME/10

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/519,129

Applicant(s)

UEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Martin J Angebrannt

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2001 and 02 January 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

1 The response provided by the applicant has been read and given careful consideration. Responses to the arguments offered by the applicant are presented after the first rejection to which they are directed. Rejections of the previous office action not appearing below are withdrawn based upon the arguments and amendments of the applicant. The drawing changes are approved. The translation provided by the applicant is appreciated and made of record on the PTO-892.

2 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4 Claims 1,(7/1), 8 and (10-11/8) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being fully anticipated by Brady et al. '546.

Brady et al. '546 teaches a wafer substrate which is coated with a photoresist (photopolymer) material. The photoresist laminate is precut, with the photoresist sandwiched between a MYLAR and a polyolefin sheet and bonded to a transport tape. The polyolefin layer is removed and the exposed portion of the photoresist is contacted with the wafer and adhered thereto.

The limitations of claims 10 and 11 are considered intended use as the means are described as means for handling these films and the films are not described as part of the apparatus. The examiner holds that the semiconductor/silicon substrates described inherently are able to function as supports for holographic recording materials.

The applicant argues that the iterative feeding of the sheets is not taught by the reference as a backing tape is used. The examiner holds that the claims currently embrace the example of the reference as it feeds the resist decals cut from the sheets iteratively/repeatedly via the carrier tape. The rejection stands.

5 Claims 1,(7/1), 8 and (10-11)/8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady et al. '546, further in view of Ueda JP 09-054539 and Smith et al. '778.

Ueda JP 09-054539 teaches holographic dry plates which comprise either a supporting film, a photopolymeric holographic recording medium, a substrate, a tacky adhesive layer and a light absorption film or a supporting film, a photopolymeric holographic recording medium, a substrate, a light absorbing adhesive film and a substrate. The peeling of the separator from the photosensitive layer and the support and contacting it with one side of a support and peeling the separator from a tacky adhesive layer and light absorption film and contacting it with the other side of the support is disclosed. (abstract).

Smith et al. '778 teaches that for dry film resists various materials may be used as supports and that these supports may be provided with antihalation, anchor or adhesive layers.

The examiner holds that the limitations of claims 10 and 11 are considered intended use as the means are described as means for handling these films and the films are not described as part of the apparatus, but anticipates the possibility that the applicant will add the film as part of the apparatus limitations.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the means disclosed by Brady et al. '546 in the process of Ueda JP 09-054539 with a reasonable expectation of achieving the desired result based upon the disclosed functionality within the photoresist handling art and with the advantage of continuous processing and upon the teaching within Smith et al. '778 that the use of adhesive, anchor or antihalation layers is desirable for use with dry resist materials.

8 Claims 1,2,(7/1,2), 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady et al. '546, in view of Garber '221 and Platzer et al. '873.

Garber '221 teaches the lamination of photoresist material in a vertical orientation and cutting of the film to fit. The benefit of the more vertical orientation is that the resist is applied without wrinkles or the like.

Platzer et al. '873 teaches an apparatus for peeling carrier films from photoresists and the like which require little horizontal space and does not require the use of an adhesive tape or element to perform the peeling. (2/67-3/5).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the means disclosed by Garber '221 and Platzer et al. '873 in place of those used in the process of Brady et al. '546 based upon the disclosure of equivalent function and the reduced space requirements and wrinkling disclosed as advantages or to use orient the peeling and lamination apparatus of Brady et al. '546 to gain the advantages attributed to this orientation by Garber '221 and Platzer et al. '873.

The rejection stands for the reasons provided above without further comment as no further arguments were directed at this rejection.

Art Unit: 1756

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nemoto et al. 457 (3/7-13), Sinta et al. '102 (1/54-65 and 2/46-55) teach the use of antihalation layers with photoresists.

Chao et al. (4/7), Schlesinger et al. '449 (14/15) and Wreede '923 (4/8) teach the use of semiconductor wafers/substrates as useful supports for holographic recording materials.

Freisitzer et al. '450 is cumulative to Brady et al. '546.

12 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin Angebranndt whose telephone number is (703) 308-4397.

I am normally available between 7:30 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Thursday and 7:30 AM and 4:00 PM on alternate Fridays.

If repeated attempts to reach me are unsuccessful, my supervisor may be reached at (703) 308-2464.

Facsimile correspondence should be directed to (703) 872-9311.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



Martin J. Angebranndt
Primary Examiner, Group 1750
March 5, 2002